with my compliments - A.R.

232

THE THEOLOGICAL ASPECT OF SOME VARIANT READINGS IN THE ISAIAH SCROLL

ARIE RUBINSTEIN

Reprinted from

THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES

Vol. VI. No. 4. 1955

From
A. RUBINSTEIN,
111, Albert Avenue,
Prestwich,
Lancs. England.

JEWISH CHRONICLE PUBLICATIONS, 37 FURNIVAL STREET, LONDON, E.C.4

THE THEOLOGICAL ASPECT OF SOME VARIANT READINGS IN THE ISAIAH SCROLL*

The nature of the variant readings in the Isaiah Scroll[1] is not such as would justify the view that the theology proper of the Scroll differs materially from that of the Book of Isaiah in the MT. The adjective " theological " as used in the present paper must therefore be understood in a more limited sense, as denoting certain religious susceptibilities which can reasonably be inferred from the variant readings selected for discussion. These readings, whether original or not, are without exception meaningful and therefore not improbably deliberate. The present paper attempts to elucidate their meaning and to make their possible purpose explicit. This is ventured with the proviso that in the nature of the case the argument cannot be based on data which are wholly objective and that a measure of the speculative is unavoidable. What can be claimed, however, is that the readings admit of the interpretation given of them and are consistent with their suggested purpose. Where considerations exist to warrant the conclusion that a Scroll reading is not original, it will probably reflect some purpose extraneous to the prophecy of Isaiah as transmitted by Jewish tradition. On the other hand, such a purpose may well be present even where there is little to choose between the Scroll reading and the corresponding reading in the MT. In so far as anything is assumed at all in this paper, it is (a) that a textual variant must be taken to have some purpose, unless the reading is patently meaningless or can otherwise be shown to be an error, and (b) that the foregoing assumption applies to minimal variations no less than to the more extensive ones. It must be admitted, however, that the minimal variations raise a difficult problem, namely, that of the relationship, if any, between what appear to be stylistic modifications and their exegetical significance. This applies especially to the additional prepositions and conjunctions found in the Scroll. Some of these are undoubtedly mere stylistic simplifications, as, for example, the *lamedh* preposition

* Paper read at the Institute of Jewish Studies on December 5, 1955.

1 *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, Vol. I, ed. by MILLAR BURROWS, etc., New Haven, 1950—hereinafter referred to as " the Scroll." The Scroll orthography is ignored in the present paper except in quotations of the variant readings.

prefixed in a number of instances to the infinitive construct.[2] Yet there are instances in which the purpose of additional particles found in the Scroll is more ambiguous.

Now with regard to their possible purpose, the variant readings which are the subject of the following remarks can be divided into two broad types. The first comprises instances which appear to aim at preventing an erroneous or irreverent interpretation of a given passage, especially where such an interpretation could result from too literal an approach to the text. The second type may have the more positive purpose of giving expression or emphasis to particular religious views or sentiments.

Turning to the first type of variants, we find the following examples:

iv, 2. The Scroll has at the end of this verse the additional word ויהודה. The effect of this is to make Judah expressly share in the idyllic future painted by the prophet, though there is little reason to believe that לפליטת ישראל in the MT. is limited to the "escaped" of the northern kingdom. The additional word may be due to the influence of the metaphors in ch. v, 7, where the house of Israel is described as the "vineyard of the Lord" and the man of Judah as his "pleasant plant," which correspond to the "sprout of the Lord" and "the fruit of the earth" in iv, 2. Or, again, it is possible that ויהודה is a mere echo of פליטת בית יהודה in xxxvii, 31.[3] Be that as it may, the addition in iv, 2, is best explained by the supposition that it was intended to make it unequivocally clear that both the northern and the southern kingdoms are destined to enjoy the future predicted by the prophet.

xxix, 13. ותהי יראתם אתי מצות אנשים מלמדה; the Scroll reads מצות (+כ).

The additional preposition is consistent with the tendency in the Scroll to avoid parataxis and may serve here to make the subtle adverbial clause explicit. It may be equally possible, however, that the preposition was intended to guard against the interpretation that the fear of God might conceivably be the precept of *men*. It is precisely in this sense that the Karaites, for example, distinguish in their polemics between דרך התורה and מצות אנשים מלמדה the latter phrase meaning for them the Mishnah and Gemara.[4]

[2] See, for example, i, 20; ix, 13; xxxii, 14, 17; xxxvi, 9; xxxvii, 38; xlix, 4; and lviii, 4; and cf. i, 12 and lviii, 13, where parallels are involved.

[3] Here, however, the reference is clearly limited to the southern kingdom.

[4] See N. Wieder, *The Doctrine of the two Messiahs among the Karaites*, in the *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 1955, Vol. VI, No. 1, pp. 24-25.

xlv, 18. The following is the MT. reading, two additional conjunctions in the Scroll being indicated in brackets:

כי כה אמר יהוה בורא השמים הוא האלהים
(+ו) יצר הארץ ועשה (+ו) הוא כוננה

The first line would offer no difficulty even to the most literally-minded exegete, but this is not the case with the second line. For although the first line asserts that Yahweh is the creator of the *heavens* and that He is God, the second line would when interpreted literally merely yield the circuitous definition "he that formed the earth and made it, he established it." The effect of the two additional conjunctions in the Scroll is to prevent just this interpretation. The poetically balanced parallels of the MT. are obliterated and their place is taken by the naïvely prosaic but didactic and ambiguity-proof statement: ". . . *and the creator* (lit.: former) *of the earth and its maker and he established it.*" It is difficult to believe that the gain in explicitness, resulting from the fact that the formally independent *subjects* יצר and עשה become *predicates* on a par with הוא האלהים, is purely coincident with conjunctions intended as stylistic modifications.

xlviii, 16. לא מראש בסתר דברתי מעת היותה שם אני; the Scroll reads בעת for מעת—which is significant in view of the fact that agreement of prepositions in parallel clauses is found more frequently in the Scroll than in the MT. The Scroll reading could be accidental, but it is an essential consideration that the variation provides against the ambiguity of the word היותה. For in verse 16 it has an impersonal subject and in all probability refers to the summoning of Cyrus, but it could erroneously be taken to refer to the Creation spoken of in verse 13 and thus imply that God's existence begins with the Creation.

lvi, 6. ובני הנכר הנלוים על יהוה לשרתו ולאהבה את שם יהוה להיות לו לעבדים כל שמר שבת מחללו ומחזיקים בבריתי. The Scroll reads: ובני הנכר הנלויים על יהוה להיות לו לעבדים .ולברך את שם יהוה ושומרים את השבת וג"ו. Now while it is difficult to account for the omission of לאהבה, we venture to suggest that the omission of לשרתו may have been prompted by the desire to exclude an interpretation which would take the latter word in the sense of ministering to Yahweh in a capacity of Priests and Levites.

The LXX had the word לשרתו in their Vorlage, yet their rendering suggests the possible existence of a divergent Jewish tradition. Thus the LXX reading in lvi, 6, "that they may be to him for bondmen

and bondwomen," presupposes a Hebrew text להיות לו לעבדים ולשפחות. This, like its shorter counterpart in the MT., may well be explanatory of לשרתו and in that case the express mention of "bondwomen" would by implication rule out the possibility that Priestly and Levitical services would be rendered by the "Strangers." What is perhaps more significant is that Codex B of the LXX reads in lvi, 6, "being to him bondmen," etc., or "by being," etc., an expression in the style of Aquila[5] which pointedly defines, we think, what is meant by לשרתו. It would not be surprising, therefore, if the Scroll resolved the difficulty by omitting the word with the effect that lvi, 6, is brought more closely into line with xiv, 2, according to which the *gerim* are to be bondmen and bondwomen to the children of Israel and in an altogether abject position, as well as with the tenor of lxi, 6.

lxiv, 9, ציון מדבר היתה ירושלם שממה; the Scroll reads מדבר (+כ) and ממה (+ו) ש (*i.e., shomemah*)—terms which appear to soften the harshness of the otherwise perfect parallels of the MT.

lxvi, 16. כי באש יהוה נשפט ובחרבו את־כל־בשר; the Scroll reads יבוא לשפוט for נשפט.

The Scroll reading is consistent with its motive being to preclude the irreverent construction which would result if the verb were taken in the purely passive sense of "to be judged." The variation, incidentally, involves a subtle change of meaning from את as = "with" to את as = the accusative particle.

We turn now to consider the second type of variant readings. These admit of explanations in terms of diverse considerations of a religious nature.

xix, 20. כי יצעקו אל יהוה . . . וישלח להם מושיע ורב והצילם the Scroll reads ושלח (or: ישלח)[6] for וישלח and has וירד for ורב.

[5] R. R. Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint*, Cambridge, 1909, note *ad loc.* The M.T. reading in lxvi, 21, *lakkohanim laleviyyim* may also be tendentious, as the following considerations would appear to suggest. The LXX and Targum reflect a Hebrew text in which the above words had indefinite prepositions or none at all, though two MSS. of the Targum have מהוי לכהניא and לשמשא לכהנ א respectively (see J. F. Stenning's apparatus in *The Targum of Isaiah*, Oxford, 1949). These last two readings appear to reflect some uneasiness lest it might be understood erroneously that the "strangers" will be taken to serve *as* Priests and Levites. The reading in Codex A of the LXX shows that its Vorlage had the word לי after אקח, which is also the reading of the Scroll. Clearly, if one reads the words לכוהנים ללוים in the Scroll with definite prepositions לי must be taken as *dativus commodi; i.e.,* "I will take *me* for the Priests for the Levites," a somewhat light-hearted tone for a solemn declaration. The Massoretic pointing *lakkohanim laleviyyim* suggests that either the foreigners bringing the children of Israel back to their land or the vehicles mentioned in the complement will be taken to serve *the* Priests and *the* Levites.

[6] Plate XV, line 28, in the Scroll shows that the letter transcribed on the page facing the plate as *waw* might be *yodh*.

It has been suggested that the protasis is to be understood here to be "when they cry unto the Lord, etc., that he may send them a saviour"[7] and that this would make Yahweh quite naturally the subject of the last two verbs in the apodosis.[8] It is questionable, however, whether, in view of the distance that separates the imperfect (with simple *waw*) of the verb "send" from the verb "cry," the suggested construction is syntactically defensible.[9] On the other hand, the Scroll reading ושלח (or ישלח) accords with normal Biblical usage to employ a perfect consecutive (or a bare imperfect) in the apodosis of a conditional or causal construction.[10] Now while the Scroll reading relieves the verse of the embarrassing ורב, which could be taken as an additional *nomen agentis* and would go ill with the verb והצילם in the singular, one is still left in doubt as to whether God or a saviour other than He will execute the deliverance. The Scroll reading וירד points, however, to a saviour of a supramundane order whose abode is on high, unless indeed the verb is merely used in the idiomatic sense of "going down to Egypt."

xxvi, 4. מתים בל־יחיו וגו" ותאבד כל זכר למו; the Scroll reads ותאסר for ותאבד.

This curious variant can hardly be due to an error of the purely mechanical kind. If it *is* an error the conscious attitude of the scribe to the text may have been a contributory cause, since the variant admits, we think, of a reasonable explanation if ותאסר is taken in its post-exilic meaning "*and thou didst forbid.*"

It is important to note that while, according to the MT, the very memory of the lords who have formerly had dominion over Israel is said to have been utterly destroyed by God, it is not so according to the Scroll reading. The latter asserts that God had *forbidden* the memory of Israel's former rulers. Clearly, the word *zekher* as used by the Scroll can either be a metaphor for "vestige" or be taken in the more literal sense of *memory, remembrance,* or *memorial*, but taken as the object of the verb "forbid" it cannot possibly have reference to something blotted out, which

[7] *ICC, The Book of Isaiah,* Vol. I, Edinburgh, 1928, p. 340.

[8] *Phil. n.,* at p. 342.

[9] *ICC's* argument relies on S. R. Driver's *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew,* Oxford, 1892, § 136 and § 62, but the examples in the first are not exhaustive, and in the second not apposite to the construction under discussion.

[10] Two of the MSS. utilised by Stenning for his edition of the *Targum of Isaiah* also read ושלח, while three others have רישלח (see text and apparatus).

ex hypothesi cannot come back. Yet the prohibition could be explained without difficulty as relating to practices reminiscent of cultic rites of the former lords. Such an interpretation would point to a possible motive for the variant. That is to say, the Scroll, if one may be permitted this convenient personification, appears to fight shy of the assertion that no vestige of foreign cultic rites remains or is ever likely to reappear in Israel. The reading "*and thou didst forbid*" by implication declares possible present and future lapses from exclusive loyalty to Yahweh to be a transgression of His command. The Scroll passage xxvi, 14, makes assurance doubly sure. On the one hand, it records, like the corresponding passage in the MT, Israel's loyalty to Yahweh even under foreign rulers and the utter destruction of the latter ; yet on the other hand, unlike the MT passage, it obliquely warns Israel against any memory (or memorial) of foreign masters. In other words: whereas the MT passage is purely a recital of events which have happened in the past, the Scroll contrives to read into the passage also a prohibition which has reference to the future.[11]

It remains to point out that the use of the verb אמר makes it unlikely that the Scroll reading is original, since the verb does not occur in OT Hebrew in the sense of "forbid," though the usage is common enough in later Hebrew. It is perhaps of some significance that the usage is found in a Qumran Hebrew MS,[12] that is, if the reconstruction of the text alluded to can be relied on. Curiously enough, this post-exilic document purports to give words spoken by Moses and affects a Biblical style.

xli, 2. מי העיר ממזרח צדק יקראהו לרגלו יתן לפניו גוים ומלכים ירד The Scroll has a *waw* prefixed to the second and third verbs and reads יוריד for רד.

Now while according to the Massoretic accentuation צדק cannot be the object of the verb, it must necessarily be so according to the Scroll reading. This consideration, coupled with the fact that also the ancient Versions take *ṣedeq* to be the object, has led D. BARTHELEMY[13] to form the impression that the Sopherim had

[11] It is interesting that in the Targum rendering the foreign *nations* are described as still serving "the dead who shall not live, their heroes who shall not rise" and then follows: "therefore thou (*i.e.*, God) shalt destroy them all and make their memory perish." Like the users of the Scroll the Targumist must have felt in his own way that Is. xxvi, 14, did not correspond to the reality of his time.

[12] *Qumran Cave I*, ed. D. BARTHÉLEMY, O.P., and J. T. MILIK, Oxford, 1955, I, Q, 22, col. III, line 11.

[13] *Revue Biblique*, 1950, No. 4, p. 548.

endeavoured to avoid at all costs the "spontaneous" reading of the Versions and of the Scroll, perhaps in order to combat a messianic interpretation given to the passage by some Jewish sectarians. Although BARTHELEMY includes the variant among the "variantes messianiques," it is not clear to what extent, if any, his suspicion of the Sopherim is based on the assumption that the tense-construction in verse 2 in the Scroll is or might be original. It is relevant therefore to point out that if the *waw* prefixed to the verbs is taken as conjunctive, the construction will be plainly against Biblical usage, whether the passage as a whole or in part is understood in a past *or* future sense. On the other hand, if the *waw* is taken as consecutive the passage must be given a *past* sense and cannot be "messianic." Furthermore, one would expect the form הוריד when the *waw*-consecutive becomes detached from the verb. There are valid reasons, therefore, to believe that the Scroll reading is not original. It may well be that someone interested in giving the passage a "messianic" significance has dealt inadequately with the tense-construction. It must be insisted, however, that the only conclusion warranted by the Scroll reading is that it envisages some person or other designated *ṣedeq* and this conclusion is independent of the correctness or otherwise of the syntax of the passage—it follows from the fact that a *waw* is prefixed to יקראהו. The Scroll reading does not shed light on the identity or nature of the figure *ṣedeq* and to go beyond this would be illegitimate speculation.

xli, 3. At the end of this verse the Scroll reads לוא יבינו for the MT לא יבוא.

It must be noted that, far from being odd, the Scroll reading makes sense if the words לוא יבינו are read at the beginning of what is now verse 4 in the MT. This would yield, and we believe was meant to yield, the text לוא יבינו מי פעל ועשה. Accordingly, verse 4 would be affirmative and not rhetorically interrogative as it is in the MT. "They understand not who hath wrought and done" would refer to the nations summoned by Yahweh to a controversy to determine whether their gods are supreme or He. This much is implicit in the MT, but the Scroll makes it explicit and does so by introducing a phrase which in its context bears a close resemblance to one in verse 20 of chapter xlv, as the following comparison shows:

xlv, 20. "*they have no knowledge* that carry wood of their graven image. . . . Declare ye, and bring forth . . . who hath

shewed this from ancient time ? who hath declared it of old ? "

xli, 4. " they understand not who hath wrought and done, he that calleth the generations from the beginning."

In view of the striking affinity which chapter xli has with chapter xlv in structure, phraseology, and ideas, one must reckon with the possibility that the phrase " they understand not " was introduced into the Scroll under the influence of verse 20 in chapter xlv, in order to round off the characterisation of the idolatrous world after the pattern of that chapter.

Our discussion has so far proceeded on the tacit assumption that the Scroll reading is not original. Indeed, three considerations combine in support of this assumption. First, the phrase is not found in the ancient Versions. Second, although the LXX attests a Hebrew text יעבר שלום ארח ברגליו in verse 3, it begins verse 4 exactly like the MT. Third, a telling consideration against the Scroll reading being original, is the logical hiatus between " they understand not who hath wrought and done " and " he that calleth the generations from the beginning."

xlv, 7. יוצר אור ובורא חשך עשה שלום ובירא רע; the Scroll reads טוב for שלום.

It has often been pointed out that in the MT reading רע is used in antithesis to שלום (well-being) and is to be understood as " misfortune." In the Scroll reading, however, טוב and רע could have moral connotations and the reading may thus be an affirmation of the doctrine of the sectaries of Qumran, who held that both good and evil are created by God and that the morally good or bad in human conduct is predetermined by Him, at least for the duration of the period preceding the ultimate " visitation."

xlvi, 1. כרע בל קרס נבו היו עצביהם לחיה ולבהמה נשאתיכם עמוסות משא לעיפה; the Scroll reads משמיעיהמה for משא לעיפה.

The exegesis of the MT passage is notoriously difficult. Ibn Ezra and Qimḥi, for example, explain היו לחיה ולבהמה as meaning that the Babylonian idols are assigned to animals and beasts in order to be carried away. Thereafter the two exegetes part company: Ibn Ezra equates *nesu'oth* with the beasts, while Qimḥi takes the word to refer to the idols as the burden borne by the beasts. So far as the MT reading is concerned, Qimḥi's explanation is clearly the better of the two, the passive form *nesu'ah* being more appropriate for what is carried than for the carrier. But even Qimḥi's explanation fails to resolve the difficulty inherent in the

MT passage which follows. Verse 2 in the MT says: " they stoop, they bow down, together they could not deliver the burden, but themselves are gone into captivity." Now, it is a little difficult to understand to whom these words refer. If by *nesu'oth* is meant the burden, it would scarcely seem likely that it was the prophet's intention to make the paradoxical point that the *nesu'oth* could not deliver the *massa'*. On the other hand, if by *nesu'oth* are meant the beasts, the satire that they, too, are gone into captivity would be palpably weak. There is ground for the belief, therefore, that verses 1-2 may have suffered corruption.[14] As against this, it can be shown that the Scroll reading משמיעיהמה, although possibly an attempt at quasi-editorial improvement, yields tolerably good sense and a self-sufficient explanation of verses 1-2.

The modern view, embodied also in the RV, is that נשאתיכם is to be understood as meaning " the things that ye carried about." This appears to us to offer the only possible clue to the understanding of the Scroll version. That is to say, the picture resulting from the Scroll reading is that the *'aṣabim*, the idols, who are themselves loaded upon the beasts, are burdened with the weight of their *mashmi'im*, *i.e.*, those who proclaim them, their adherents.[15] It is, moreover, a plausible supposition that *'aṣabim* were replicas of Bel and Nebo worshipped by the people and carried about by them. Such a supposition would explain the possessive suffix הם and would suggest that a large number of Bel's and Nebo's worshippers were attempting to escape from Babylon on the beasts carrying the *'aṣabim*.

The proposed explanation of the Scroll reading would bring out the full contrast offered by verses 3-4 where the house of Jacob is described by God as having been borne from belly and carried from the womb[15a] and end with the words " and even to old age I am he, and even to hoar hairs will I carry: I have made, and I will bear ; yea I will carry and deliver."

If *mashmi'im* could mean those who profess Bel and Nebo, verses 1-2 would contain elements antithetically parallel to those found in verses 3-4, that is, the Babylonians in contrast to the house

---

14 For a comprehensive, if not entirely convincing, explanation of the MT passage on the lines of the Targum rendering, see C. C. Torrey, *The Second Isaiah*, Edinburgh, 1928, commentary *ad loc.*

15 See following note.

15a The seemingly active forms of the last two verbs in the Scroll as well as the reading ממני, can only be explained as an error.

of Jacob, and *nesu'oth*—an epithet for the man-made and man-carried idol described in verse 7—in contrast to Yahweh.

The foregoing interpretation is, however, not without its difficulty, since the participle *mashmi'im* does not occur in the OT in the clear sense of " announcers " or " proclaimers."[16] Yet it would seem that the word is an essential element in the picture, because it emphasises the doom of the Babylonian idolaters no less than that of their idols. Such a consideration could have inspired the Scroll reading, which, whether original or not, is exegetically not unattractive. The term *mashmi'im* could be explained, however, more simply, as the equivalent of *musicians* and might well be an echo of the phrase ומצלתים למשמיעים in I Ch. xvi, 42. This explanation would suggest that Bel and Nebo, as well as those who had ministered to them by singing their praises, were doomed to perdition. In their function of musicians the *mashmi'im* could vicariously represent the Babylonian worshippers.

lii, 12. The Scroll has at the end of this verse the additional words אלוהי כול הארץ יקרא. This, it will be observed, impairs the parallels by the introduction of the new predicate יקרא which is without a parallel in the first part of the verse. MILLAR BURROWS[17] has suggested that the addition may be due to the influence of liv, 5, yet one cannot help noticing how much more apposite the addendum is in lii, 12. For its obvious purpose is to explain that the redemption of Israel will be acknowledged by all nations as the work of the one and only God and that there will therefore be no one to harass the Children of Israel or cause them to depart in haste. One cannot overlook, however, another possible explanation, though not necessarily an alternative to the one given above.

Attention has been drawn by various commentaries to the fact that the words " for ye shall not go out in haste " are strongly evocative of the exodus from Egypt, whether or not they are expressly chosen as a contrast to Deuteronomy xvi, 3. From such an association of ideas there would be but a short step to the further contrast of the formula יהוה אלהי העברים used by Moses and Aaron in their demands of the unresponsive Pharaoh and the formula יהוה אלוהי כול הארץ, which in the context of lii, 12,

[16] The nearest instance is in Is. xli, 26; in lii, 7 (twice), and in Na. ii, 1, the participle is in the constr. st. and part of an adjectival phrase to *mebhasser*, while in Je. iv, 15. it is part of the predicate of the implied *Ḳol*.

[17] *BASOR*, 1948, No. 111, p. 19—a comment incidental to the listing of the variant readings of the Scroll.

implies ready willingness on the part of the nations to release the Children of Israel from their midst. One suspects that a midrashic exposition may underlie the addendum, and one is even tempted to think of such a midrash as being introduced by the words " for not like the former redemption will be the latter redemption "—a vision of a פסח לעתיד, to borrow the refrain of a piyyuṭ in the Passover liturgy.

Two variants which may be subsumed under the heading " eschatological " remain to be considered.

xlii, 1. נתתי רוחי עליו משפט לגוים יוציא; the Scroll reads ומשפטו for משפט.

BARTHELEMY,[18] who first called attention to this variant, translates the last three words " promulgera *sa* religion pour les nations." He is careful to point out, however, that " religion " is an inadequate term and that *mishpaṭ* is to be understood in the context as the totality of rules to govern human action in conformity with the divine design.[19] In trying to explain the absence of the suffix in the MT reading BARTHELEMY goes on to say: " could it be that ' his religion ' shocked certain Sopherim, especially being placed as it is: in the first line of the poem."[20] He admits that verse 4 in the MT contains the word ולתורתו " which has not been corrected," but adds that " the corrections, if such they be in the present case, lack sometimes logic, and on the other hand the construction ' the isles shall wait for his law ' rendered it more difficult to suppress the suffix."[21] Now, much of this is rather unrewarding speculation, since it is difficult to think of any criteria which would help one determine whether the Scroll reading or that of the MT is original. The objective effect of the Scroll reading is, surely, this: if the additional suffix is taken to be in the singular, it will not import into the passage anything which is not implicit already in the term תורתו in verse 4 in the MT. On the other hand, if, on analogy with the suffix זרועו (twice) in DSIa li, 5, the suffix is taken to be in the plural the effect will be to tilt the scales slightly in favour of interpreting the terms " Servant " and " Elect " in verse 1 as having reference to an individual, since the plural form would accentuate the sense of " judgments " or " edicts " promulgated by the

[18] *Op. cit.*, pp. 547-8.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 547, note 1.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 547.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 548.

Servant.[22] One consideration in favour of reading the suffix as that of the plural is of an orthographic nature, viz., that while משפט of the MT becomes in the Scroll ומשפטו, ולתורתו of the MT becomes ולתורתיו. A possible explanation of this is that the suffix of *mishpaṭ* is that of the plural, while that of *torah* is that of the singular, both usages being well attested in the Qumran MSS.[23] On the other hand, there is clear evidence that the sectaries of Qumran used the term " Elect " also in a corporate sense. Thus, for example, the *Pesher Habakkuk*[24] contains an eschatological passage in which God's Elect, in the plural (*beḥiraw*), are spoken of as executing " judgments " on the nations at the consummation of the " last epoch." At the same time it is clear from the *Pesher* passage that the Elect of God are not identical with the whole of Israel, but are conceived as a faithful remnant such as the sectaries of Qumran regarded themselves to be.[25] If the term " Elect " goes back, as is generally assumed with regard to its use in other pseudepigrapha, to xlii, 1, due weight must be given to the possibility that there is in the Qumran MSS a certain oscillation between the individual and corporate aspects of the term " Elect." Yet, although the sect collectively and the individual " Elect " may have distinct eschatological missions, the two concepts need not be mutually exclusive. We may postpone our conclusion on this point until we have examined the next variant.

li, 5. קרוב צדקי יצא ישעי וזרעי עמים ישפטו אלי איים יקוו ואל זרעי ייחלון. The Scroll reads זרועו (twice), אליו and יוחילון.

W. H. BROWNLEE,[26] amplifying a suggestion made by BARTHELEMY,[27] has pointed out that the logical antecedent of זרועו must be taken to be ישעי and concludes that ישע must therefore be the title of a coming person who is to be the saviour of the

22 On the term *mishpaṭ* cf. H. H. ROWLEY, *The Servant of the Lord*, London, 1954, p. 14 and references to other writers, *ibid.*, note 2. The present writer is inclined to equate *mishpaṭ* in xlii, 1, with a declaratory judgment; this seems to accord with the use of the verb *hoṣi'*.

23 See *Qumran Cave I*, p. 127, note to line 28, and p. 109 (penultimate paragraph of introductory remarks). See also Z. BEN. ḤAYYIM in *Sepher Asaph*, Jerusalem, 1953, Appendix, pp. 94-5.

24 Col. V, line 4.

25 For a full discussion of the problems involved see K. ELLIGER, *Studien zum Habakuk—Kommentar von Toten Meer*, Tübingen, 1953, pp. 139-140 and p. 182, and *Qumran Cave I*, p. 141, for references to the term " Elect of God " in other writings of the Sect.

26 *The United Presbyterian* of November 29, 1954, pp. 6-7, and see also the same publication for December 13, 1954, pp. 10-11, and for December 27, 1954, p. 10 and p. 13.

27 *Op. cit.*, p. 548.

world, a Messiah promised *to* the Jewish nation and not a personified Israel.

There is, indeed, a difference between the views of BARTHELEMY and BROWNLEE, for while the latter treats the variants under discussion as the product of the sectaries of Qumran, the former goes a long way towards suggesting that the Scroll readings may represent original readings suppressed by the scribes and priests, to whom the mere claim of a temporal " messianisme " was repugnant.[28] The problem, however, is not by any means so simple as the treatment of the variants by BARTHELEMY and BROWNLEE would suggest. To begin with, assuming, as BARTHELEMY implicitly does, that the suffixes in the Scroll readings in xlii, 1, and li, 5, have reference to one and the same eschatological figure, there is nothing to preclude the supposition that these suffixes are harmonistic modifications occasioned by the original passage " the isles shall wait for *his law* " in xlii, 4. Such harmonistic devices are found elsewhere in the Scroll and seem to have been a feature of the hermeneutics of its users.[29] Again, on BROWNLEE'S view one would have to assume that the sectaries have read into li, 5, the expectation of a personal Messiah rather than the collective concept of " the Chosen Ones of God " both of which appear to have been part of their settled doctrine. Such a view, though possible, would be open to the objection that the Qumran writings speak of *two* Messiahs, one of Israel and the other of Aaron. Does the problem of the Scroll readings in li, 5, admit then of a clear-cut solution ? The answer to this question must be, we think, in the affirmative, and it would seem to favour BROWNLEE'S rather than BARTHELEMY'S view. Two considerations argue against the latter's view: (a) the passage " and his arms shall judge nations " in li, 5, is scarcely in accord with the gentle nature of the eschatological figure in xlii, 2-3, and (b) while the designations *'ebedh* and *baḥir* appear to be natural in the context of xlii, 1-4, the personified " Salvation " in li, 5, strikes one as artificial. Now the *Benedictions* MS., recovered from Cave I at Qumran[30] and published recently, shows that while the *Priestly Mashiaḥ* would seem to take precedence over the

28 *Ibid.*

29 Compare, for example, the following: DSIa xxxvii, 20, with 2 Ki. xix, 19; DSIa xxxviii, 6, with Is. xxxvii, 35; DSIa li, 3, with Is. li, 11, and xxxv, 10; DSIa lii, 12, with Is. liv, 5; and DSIa lii, 8, with Ze. i, 16. Compare also DSIa ix, 6, with 2 Sa. vii, 12-13, 1 Ch. xvii, 11-12, 14, and xxviii, 7.

30 *Qumran Cave I*, 28b, at pp. 118-129.

secular *Nasi'*,[31] it is the latter who is expected to play the militant rôle against the nations. What is predicated of him in terms of various OT passages suggests a figure at once wholly righteous and one invincible in battle, probably even Davidic of origin.[32] The *Nasi'* may well be regarded therefore as the leader of the Sect of God's Elect in the final "judgments" to be executed against the nations in the end of days. It is an eschatological figure like the *Nasi'* of the Qumran *Benedictions* that is reflected in the Scroll reading in li, 5. Yet, it is important to stress again that while on this interpretation the Scroll passage li, 5, cannot be reconciled with the tenor of xlii, 1-4, no such incompatibility exists between the corresponding passages in the MT. On balance we are inclined to believe, therefore, that the personification of *yesha'* was introduced into li, 5, in order to link the passage up, albeit erroneously, with xlii, 1, by providing a synonym to *'ebedh* and *baḥir*—a purpose which could be achieved by minimal variations. Such a procedure need not be taken as a reflection on the intellectual integrity of the users of the Scroll; the occurrence in both passages of the idea of "judgment" and of the picture of the expectant isles, could account for a common *bona fide* interpretation. Whether the Scroll reading ומשפטו in xlii, 1, is original or not is a question which, in our opinion, does not admit of a definite answer, but in either case the tenor of the passage would not be radically affected. Clearly, it is the divine spirit with which the Elect is expressly invested that is the source of both the judgment(s) he issues and the instruction he gives, and this interpretation is scarcely affected by the possessive suffix in the Scroll reading.

ARIE RUBINSTEIN.

Manchester.

31 *Ibid.*, p. 121 (bottom).
32 *Ibid.*, pp. 127-129.